



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,746	09/09/2005	Navneet K. Ahluwalia	C1037.70035US01	2683
23628	7590	05/05/2008	EXAMINER	
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206			LE, EMILY M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1648		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/05/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/532,746	AHLUWALIA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Emily Le	1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/26/05, 8/25/05, 2/04/08.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17, 64, 65 and 67 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6, 7 and 67 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5, 8-17 and 64-65 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/ are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group III in the reply filed on 02/04/2008 is acknowledged.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 18-63, 66 and 68-71 are canceled. Claims 1-17, 64-65 and 67 are pending. Claims 6-7 and 67 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 02/04/2008. Claims 1-5, 8-17 and 64-65 are under examination.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See page 44 of the specification. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. Appropriate correction is required.

4. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth below or on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures.

The specification contains sequences that are not identified by a sequence identifier, SEQ ID NO:. See page 26 of the disclosure as an example. Applicant Must Provide: a substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing"; a substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment specifically directing its entry into the application; and a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-5, 8-17 and 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are directed toward a method of treating HCV infection in a subject with the administration of a CpG oligonucleotide, wherein the subject has not been successfully treated using a previous non-CpG therapy.

The basic inquiry for possession is: Can one skilled in the art reasonably conclude that the inventor was in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed? If a skilled artisan would have understood the inventor to be in

possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing, *even if every nuance of the claim is not explicitly described in the specification*, then the requirement for an adequate written description is met.

To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession, the specification must provide sufficient description of the claimed invention by i) actual reduction to practice, ii) reduction to drawings; or iii) disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, such as disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, correlation between structure and function, and methods of making the claimed invention. The analysis:

- i) Sufficient description of the claimed invention by actual reduction to practice: The specification does not teach of an oligonucleotide containing the CpG motif that treats HCV. Hence, the disclosure fails to evidence that Applicant is in possession of the claimed invention by actual reduction to practice.
- ii) Sufficient description of the claimed invention by reduction to drawings: The instant patent application does not contain any drawings demonstrating that an oligonucleotide containing the CpG motif treats HCV infection. Hence, the disclosure fails to evidence that Applicant is in possession of the claimed invention by reduction to drawings.
- iii) disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics: The disclosure fails to provide relevant identifying characteristics relating to the claimed invention. The disclosure fails to set forth the complete structure of an

Art Unit: 1648

oligonucleotide that treats HCV. The disclosure does not even set forth the partial structure of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif that treat HCV. The disclosure further failed to set forth the physical and chemical properties of oligonucleotides encompassed by the claimed invention. Furthermore, the disclosure failed to set forth any functional characteristics that oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif must possess to treat HCV.

In the instant, nothing exists in the specification to demonstrate that Applicant is in possession of an oligonucleotide containing the CpG motif that treats HCV. In the absence of any evidence demonstrating that Applicant is in possession of the primary active ingredient for the claimed invention, oligonucleotides comprising the CpG motif that treats HCV, the skilled artisan cannot reasonably conclude or recognize that Applicant is in possession of the claimed invention at the time the invention was filed.

Applicant is reminded that that written description requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement.

7. Claims 1-5, 8-17 and 64-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

To be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue

experimentation. In *Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk* 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Wright* 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); See also *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1212, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Fisher* 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). Further, in *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) the court stated:

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized by the board in *Ex parte Forman* [230 USPQ 546, 547 (Bd Pat App Int 1986)]. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

Breadth of the claims:

The claims encompass a method for treating hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection with the administration of an immunostimulatory oligonucleotide. The immunostimulatory oligonucleotides encompassed by the claimed invention is all oligonucleotides comprising the CpG motif.

Nature of the invention:

The claimed invention is directed at the immunotherapeutic use of oligonucleotide comprising the CpG motif to stimulate the immune system, including the induction of Th1 immune response invoked by the production of Th1 associated cytokines accorded by the CpG motif, to render a therapeutic treatment for hepatitis C virus.

Presence or Absence of working examples:

The specification does not contain any working examples that are directed to the claimed invention, a method of treating hepatitis C virus infection in a subject with the administration of an oligonucleotide comprising the CpG motif. The specification does not contain any working examples demonstrating that such oligonucleotides treat HCV infection. All that is present in the specification is a working example evidencing the ability of the oligonucleotide to induce Th1 immune response, including the production of IFN-alpha and gamma. However, this working example does not commensurate with the claimed invention, treating HCV infection with the administration of a CpG containing oligonucleotide. Nothing exists in the specification demonstrating that fundamental research has been conducted to support Applicant's claim, wherein oligonucleotides comprising the CpG motif treat HCV infection in a subject.

Amount of direction or guidance present in the specification:

The specification does not contain any evidence demonstrating that oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif treat HCV in any subjects. All that is present in the specification are conjectures of potential application of such oligonucleotides in the treatment of HCV infection in subjects.

State of the Art:

The hepatitis C virus (HCV) art clearly notes that the role of innate and antigen-nonspecific immune response to HCV has not yet been sufficiently characterized.¹ The art additionally acknowledges several factors that challenge the development of an

Art Unit: 1648

effective treatment for HCV. The first factor is the lack of an effective cell culture system for HCV. The second challenge is the absence of good animal models for HCV, outside of humans and chimpanzees. The other challenge is the ability of HCV to evade effective immune recognition, including recognition by cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTL), and shows an extremely high rate of viral persistence.^{2, 3, 4}

In the instant case, the involvement of a Th1 type immune response in combating against intracellular pathogens is a well-recognized general concept. The art acknowledges the importance of Th1 type immune response, which is stimulated by the production of Th1 associated cytokines, in the elimination of intracellular pathogens, including viruses. However, the art has not accredited or recognized any one particular Th1-associated cytokine to the treatment, prevention and amelioration of viral infection in a subject. Specifically, the art teaches that while cytokines secreted by T helper cells are of critical importance for the outcome of many infectious diseases, the production of the "right" set of cytokines can be a matter of life or death, as noted by Infante-Duarte et al. Infante-Duarte et al. further notes that in addition to a Th1 type immune response, a Th2 type immune response is also necessary. Specifically, Infante-Duarte et al. teaches that a tight control over where and when Th1 and Th2 immune responses happen is necessary to keep intracellular infections under control, and to prevent the

¹ Knipe DM, Howley PM, eds. Fields virology. 4th ed. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2001, 1004-1016 and 1127-1161.

² Hahn. Subversion of immune responses by hepatitis C virus: immunomodulatory strategies beyond evasion? Current opinion in Immunology, 2003, Vol. 15, 443-449.

³ Knipe DM.

⁴ De Francesco et al. Challenges and successes in developing new therapies of hepatitis C. Nature, 2005, Vol. 436, 953-960.

Art Unit: 1648

Th1 type immune response from causing damage to the host.⁵ Hence, while the importance of a Th1 type immune response is well recognized in the art, the art further notes that a balance between Th1 and Th2 type immune responses is necessary to resolve an infection.

The cytokine art also provides that the efficacy of Th1 associated cytokines, such as interleukin 2, interleukin 12 and interleukin 18, against intracellular pathogens are controversial, as evidenced by Aoki et al.,⁶ Bohn et al.,⁷ Sakao et al.,⁸ Zaitseva et al.,⁹ and Masihi, K.¹⁰ Aoki et al. teaches that while interleukin 2 may confer good protection for non-pathogenic mycobacterial strain Bacille Calmette-Guerin (BCG), interleukin 2 does not confer protection for virulent *M. bovis* infection. Bohn et al. teaches that interleukin-12, a Th1 associated cytokine, induces different effector mechanisms that result in either protection or exacerbation of a disease. Specifically, Bohn et al. notes that the administration of exogenous interleukin 12 confers protection against *Yersinia enterocolitica* in susceptible BALB/c mice, but exacerbates yersiniosis in resistant C57BL/6 mice. Sakao et al. teaches that interleukin 18, a Th1 associated cytokine, is responsible for the progression of endotoxin-induced liver injury in mice primed with interleukin 18. Zaitseva et al. teaches that both interleukin 6 and interferon

⁵ Infante-Duarte et al., Th1/Th2 balance in infection. Springer Seminars in Immunopathology, 1999, 21: 317-338. [Paragraph bridging pages 321-322, in particular.]

⁶ Aoki et al. Use of cytokines in infection. Expert Opin. Emerg. Drugs, 2004, vol. 9, No. 2, 223-236. [Lines 4-15, left column, page 229,in particular]

⁷ Bohn et al., Ambiguous role of interleukin-12 in *Yersinia enterocolitica* infection in susceptible and resistant mouse strains. Infect. Immune., 1998, Vol. 66, 2213-2220. [Abstract, in particular.]

⁸ Sakao et al. IL-18-deficient mice are resistant to endotoxin-induced liver injury but highly susceptible to endotoxin shock. Int. Immunol., 1999, Vol. 11, 471-480. [Abstract, in particular.]

⁹ Zaitseva et al. Interferon gamma and interleukin 6 modulate the susceptibility of macrophages to human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. Blood, 2000, Vol. 96, 3109-3117. [Abstract, in particular]

gamma augment the susceptibility of monocyte-derived macrophages to infection.

Masihi, K. notes that interleukin 2 increases the production of HIV in vitro, and enhances the translocation of bacteria from intestines to other organs in animal studies. In summation, the art teaches that cytokines can be inherently toxic, have unclear pharmacological behavior and also have pleiotropic effects. Hence, the art recognizes that the use of cytokine to direct treatment is unpredictable and complicated.

Additionally, while the art teaches that oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif are capable of stimulating a Th1 type immune response, however, the art also teaches that the Th1 associated cytokine profile for these oligonucleotides vary from one oligonucleotide and species of subject to the next, as evidenced by Krieg et al.¹¹ and Mutwiri et al.¹² Krieg et al notes that each oligonucleotide containing the CpG motif must be considered as a separate agent because the quality and type of immune stimulation induced by these oligonucleotides varies. Krieg et al. particularly notes that the type of cytokine stimulated by oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif is distinct from one oligonucleotide to the next. Additionally, both Krieg et al. and Mutwiri et al. note that the level and type of immune stimulation varies depending on i) the specific nucleic acids, purines and pyrimidines, surrounding the CpG motif; ii) the spacings between CpG motifs; iii) the numbers of CpG motifs in an oligonucleotide; iv) the

¹⁰ Masihi, K. Fighting infection using immunomodulatory agents. Expert Opin. Biol. Ther., 2001, Vol. 1, No. 4, 641-653. [Lines 15-25, left column of page 646, in particular]

¹¹ Krieg et al., CpG motif in bacterial DNA and their immune effects. Annu. Rev. Immunol., 2002, Vol. 20, 709-760. [paragraph that bridge pages 716-717, in particular.]

¹² Mutwiri et al. Biological activity of immunostimulatory CpG DNA motifs in domestic animals. Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology, 2003, Vol. 91, 89-103. [See 2nd and 3rd full paragraphs, left column of page 93; last sentence of paragraph bridging pages 89-90.]

Art Unit: 1648

absence or presence of a CpG motif to the end of the oligonucleotide; and v) the context in which the CpG motif is presented in the sequence.

The CpG art further teaches that the immunostimulatory activity of oligonucleotides containing the CpG is very species specific, as evidenced by Mutwiri et al. Table 1 of Mutwiri et al. provides that the *in vitro* immunostimulatory activity of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif varies from one species to the next. Mutwiri et al. also notes that the level of immunostimulating induced by a particular oligonucleotide is also dependent on the sequence(s) flanking the CpG motif. Specifically, Mutwiri et al. notes that the GTCGTT motif, which is the optimal motif for humans, is optimal for stimulation of lymphocyte proliferation in several species including cattle, sheep, goats, horses, pigs, dogs, cats and chickens; whereas the murine CpG motif (GACGTT) is only optimal for inbred rabbits and mice.

Furthermore, both Krieg et al. and Mutwiri et al. sets forth that the recognition of the CpG motifs requires Toll-like receptor (TLR) 9, wherein cells that express TLR-9 produce Th1 associated cytokines. However, Mutwiri et al. provides that TLR-9 has only been identified in mice and humans. Mutwiri et al. also provides that the TLR-9 is differentially expressed in humans and mice. Hence, if the recognition of the CpG motif were dependent of TLR-9, then it would logically follows that the extent of the Th1 type immune response induced by the oligonucleotide would necessarily vary from one species to the next. Mutwiri et al. also sets forth that *in vitro* observations do not accurately predict what happens *in vivo*.

Art Unit: 1648

Moreover, the potential use of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif to stimulate a Th1 type immune response that treats and prevents infection is widely speculated in the art. However, efforts to harness the immunostimulatory activity of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif to trigger an innate immune response that protect a host from infectious pathogen has proven to be challenging and elusive, as evidenced by Yamamoto et al.,¹³ Equils et al.,¹⁴ Agrawal et al.,¹⁵ and Olbrich et al.¹⁶ Yamamoto et al. reports that oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif failed to improve the survival in mice challenged with influenza. Equils et al. teaches that such oligonucleotides can induce the HIV transcriptional regulatory elements in long terminal repeats, increasing viral replication. Agrawal et al. teaches that HIV-infected humans treated with oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif showed dose-dependent increases viral load. Lastly, Olbrich et al. teaches that the administration of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif accelerated and increased the severity of Friend retrovirus in mice. In the case of Olbrich et al., the author notes that the use of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif for the treatment of viral infection may be a double edge sword that can resolve in effective therapy but also in acceleration of disease. Olbrich et al. notes that this double edge sword observation may be dependent on the time point of treatment.

¹³ Yamamoto et al., Oligodeoxyribonucleotides with 5'ACGT-3' or 5TCGA-3 sequence induce production of interferons. Curr. Top. Microbiol. Immunol. 2000, Vol. 247, 23-40.

¹⁴ Equils et al. Toll-like receptor 2 (TLR2) and TLR9 signaling resulted from HIV-long terminal repeat transactivation and HIV replication in HIV-1 transgenic mouse spleen cells: implications of simultaneous activation of TLRs on HIV replication. J. Immunol. 2003, 170, 5159-5164.

¹⁵ Agrawal, et al. Was induction of HIV1 through TLR9? J. Immunol. 2003, 171, 1621-1621.

¹⁶ Olbrich et al. Preinfection treatment of resistant mice with CpG oligodeoxynucleotides renders them susceptible to friend retrovirus-induced leukemia. J. Virol., 2003, 77, 10658-10662.

Art Unit: 1648

Hence, overall, the literature notes the use of CpG to stimulate the production of cytokines, the use of cytokines to influence viral infection, and the development of a treatment regimen for diseases is unpredictable and complicated.

Predictability or unpredictability of the art:

As discussed above, the art recognizes that the use of cytokine to direct treatment is unpredictable and complicated. The art also recognizes that use of CpG to stimulate cytokine production, the use of the induced cytokine to influence viral infection, and the development of treatment regimen are unpredictable and complicated. The art additionally teaches that the efforts to harness the immunostimulatory activity of oligonucleotides containing the CpG motif to trigger an innate immune response that protect, prevent or treat a host from infectious pathogen has proven to be challenging and elusive.

Quantity of experimentation necessary:

Extreme undue burden of experimentation would be imposed upon the skilled artisan practicing the claimed invention. As stated above, Applicant has not provided much, if any, guidance or direction relating to the claimed invention. All that Applicant has provided is a conclusion that is made on the basis of generalized concepts that are well known in the art. And the formation of a conclusion based on generalized concepts renders the conclusion flawed. Generalized concepts are directed to support a general direction of studies or research; however, they do not support concrete conclusions. Concrete conclusions must be substantiated by facts, including evidence. In the instant, while the general direction of research may be outlined for the skilled artisan, the skilled

Art Unit: 1648

artisan would not readily be able to practice the claimed invention without the undue burden of experimentation. The path that the skilled artisan must take in his research is marked with many challenges that are recognized in the art, including the complex nature of oligonucleotides containing CpG motif and the complexity of the immune system, including the Th1 type immune response and the functional characteristics of its associated cytokines. Hence, in view of the lack of any guidance in the specification concerning the effective use of oligonucleotides to treat HCV infection in a subject; the unpredictability of oligonucleotides containing CpG motif to stimulate specific immune response; and the inherent toxicity, the unclear pharmacological behavior, and the pleiotropic effects of cytokines; the skilled artisan would not be able to reasonably practice the claimed invention without an undue burden experimentation. Thus, the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, 1st paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F. 2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ 2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

8. No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1648

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emily Le whose telephone number is (571)272-0903.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce R. Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Emily Le/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1648

/E. L./